

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE .	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,560	12/05/2003	Aleandro DiGianfilippo	BBM-103US	9986
23122 RATNERPRES	7590 10/31/200 STIA	7	EXAM	INER
POBOX 980	CE DA 10492 0090		CABRERA	, ZOILA E
VALLET FOR	GE, PA 19482-0980		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2125	
	•	•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application	No.	Applicant(s)			
	•		,				
Office Action Summary		10/728,560		DIGIANFILIPPO ET AL.			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
	- The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Zoila E. Cabr		2125			
Period for				·			
WHIC - Extension after S - If NO - Failure Any re earner	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DASIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, uply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS 36(a). In no event, will apply and will ex, cause the applical	COMMUNICATION however, may a reply be time spire SIX (6) MONTHS from to to become ABANDONED	ely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•		•			
·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 August 2007</u> .						
<i>'</i> —	/ 	action is non					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowan	•	• •				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quay	16, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 U.G. 213.			
Disposition	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consi					
Application	·						
	The specification is objected to by the Examiner			·			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
•			-				
Attachment	• •			DTO 440)			
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date		Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal Pa Other:	te			

Art Unit: 2125

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Art Unit: 2125

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-21 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 7,194,336.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the organizational elements in both claims and their functionality are merely obvious variations of each other. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that the limitations of claims 1-21 are already included in U.S. Patent No. 7,194,336, as such they are an obvious variation of the invention, defined in the claims 1-16 of Patent No. 7,194,336.

Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Zoila Cabrera, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3738. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. EST (every other Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by phone fail, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached on (571) 272-3749. Additionally, the fax phones for Art Unit

Application/Control Number: 10/728,560

Art Unit: 2125

Page 4

2125 are (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist at (703) 305-9600.

Zoila Cabrera Primary Examiner 10/26/07

ZOILA CAE

10/26/07



United States Patent and Trademark Office

CONFIRMATION NO. 9986

SERIAL NUMBER 10/728,560	FILING OR 371(c) DATE 12/05/2003 RULE	CLASS 700	GRO	ROUP ART UNIT 2125			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. BBM-103US	
APPLICANTS Aleandro DiGianfilippo, Scottsdale, AZ; Richard S. Pierce, Glendale, AZ; *** CONTINUING DATA ****************************** This application is a CIP of 10/335,552 12/31/2002 which claims benefit of 60/344,869 12/31/2001 *** FOREIGN APPLICATIONS ************************************								
Foreign Priority dalmed 35 USC 119 (a-d) condition met Verified and Acknowledged	STATE OR COUNTRY AZ	SHEETS TOT DRAWING CLA 100 21			MS	INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 3		
ADDRESS 23122 TITLE								
Pharmaceutical comp	counding systems and m	nethods and informatio	n mana	gement	system	for sø	me	
	FEES: Authority has been given in Paper No to charge/credit DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No for following:			☐ All Fees ☐ 1.16 Fees (Filling)				
I RECEIVED INo.				1.17 Fees (Processing Ext. of time)				
788 No.				☐ 1.18 Fees (Issue)				
				Other				
					☐ Credit			